

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 13 2007

**LAW OFFICES
HURLEY & GUINN**

DANIEL W. HURLEY
DAVID M. GUINN, JR.
AARON R. CLEMENTS
NATALIO HERNANDEZ

AARON R. CLEMENTS
LICENSED TO PRACTICE IN TEXAS
REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY
EMAIL: AARONRC@SWBELL.NET

13 September 2007

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Re: App'n No. 10/724,409, Naizer et al.
Art Unit 2672
Examiner: Thompson


Dear Mr. Thompson:

Accompanying this letter please find our response to the second Office Action in the above-referenced application, which should be fully responsive to the issues raised therein. If there are any problems or questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

HURLEY & GUINN

BY:



AARON R. CLEMENTS
Reg. No. 46,025

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I certify that this correspondence was transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, (571) 273-8300 on this the 13th day of September, 2007.



AARON R. CLEMENTS
Attorney for Applicant

TELEPHONE (806) 771-0700 1805 13TH STREET, LUBBOCK, TEXAS 79401 FAX (806) 763-8199

Application Number: 10/724,409
Applicant: Naizer, et al.
Art Unit: 3672

RESPONSE TO SECOND OFFICE ACTION

Accompanying this Response are claim amendments which Applicant would suggest are fully responsive to the rejection made under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Carlisle, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 2,465,060. In particular, Applicant would note the effect of the amendments to each claim:

With respect to Claim 1, Applicant is amending the language of Claim 1 to add a limitation that the base of the piston 110 is sealed by means such as the O-ring 118. Carlisle '060 contains no similar structure sealing the piston assembly in that invention against the wall of the chamber in which the piston assembly reciprocates, and Carlisle thus cannot be used in a manner similar to the instant invention, wherein a balance is maintained between the fluid pressure on the shoulders of the piston 110 and the spring pressure 112, with the pressure on the tip of the piston 110 resulting in a force which acts independently of that resulting from the fluid pressure on the shoulders of the piston 110.

With respect to Claim 2, the amendments constitute nothing more than rewriting the former Claim 2 in independent form with all of the limitations of the prior base Claim 1, which the examining attorney has held to be allowable.

Claim 3 is identical to the former Claim 3, which retains its dependency on Claim 1 and thus is amended by implication to include the seal limitation described in that base claim as amended.

Claims 4-8 are identical to their prior forms, pursuant to the examining attorney's finding that these claims are allowable.